

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 26 2007

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in view of the above-referenced Final Office Action and Advisory Action, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

**Interview Summary**

On this date, the undersigned spoke with Examiner Moorthy over the telephone and explained how the unamended claims are consistent and meet the requirements of 35 USC 112. The substance of that explanation appears below in the Response to Advisory Action. Mr. Moorthy understands and agrees with Applicants' position in this matter in light of the more detailed analysis of the claim language and agrees that no new issues are raised. It was further agreed that the claims are to be amended to omit the "receiver device" language in the unentered amendment after final, and Mr. Moorthy will contact the undersigned if further amendment is needed to assure compliance with 35 USC 101 after review by the 101 panel for his examining group. Agreement was reached that the claims are consistent and have no issues regarding 35 USC 112. The amendments made are being retained to help assure clarity of the claims.

**Response to Advisory Action**

The Advisory Action indicates that the amendments raise new issues requiring further search. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the case. Consider Claim 1, by way of example:

Claim 1 considered without the amendments in part calls for examining unencrypted packets of a DTV signal to identify "a packet type", and later requires that packets of the packet type be replaced by first and second encrypted packets in the DTV signal to produce a multiple partially encrypted DTV signal. Since the unencrypted packets are examined to identify "a packet type" and those unencrypted packets are replaced by multiple encrypted packets to form a partially encrypted DTV signal, it logically follows that there are other unencrypted packets besides those of "the packet type". Hence, the amendment to the "examining" sub-paragraph merely reflects that which must logically follow from the unamended language of the claim.

Application No.: 10/038,217

-29-

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUN 26 2007**

These amendments are therefore believed to merely clarify the language without making a change of substance which would require further searching.

The final amendment of claim 1 in the "distributing" sub-paragraph was previously submitted in an attempt to improve the claim language from a 35 USC 101 perspective. However, Applicants submit that the amendment is unnecessary to comply with the statutory subject matter requirement. The claim clearly is to a method of encryption of a television signal which clearly has practical applicability. In the interview referenced above, it was agreed that this language would be removed and Examiner Moorthy would contact the undersigned by telephone should the 101 panel for his examining group have further requirements to render the claims statutory.

Hence, it is submitted that the claim amendments appearing herein requires no new search or consideration and raise no new issues. Moreover, it is submitted that the claims stand allowable and such allowance is requested at an early date.

#### IDS Error

The undersigned recently discovered that an error appears in the IDS submitted on May 15, 2007. Because of typographical errors appearing in the IDS, three patent documents for related applications were improperly identified. They are as follows:

US2006/029060 should be US 2006/0269060;

US2006/026926 should be US 2006/0262926; and

US 7,141,833 should be US 7,151,833.

A corrected listing showing the error is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

#### Concluding Remarks

No amendment made herein was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim unless an argument has been made herein that such amendment has been made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Applicants reserve the right to present claims of scope similar to the unamended claims in a continuing application.

Application No.: 10/038,217

In view of this communication, all claims are believed to be in clear condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested at an early date. If further matters remain to be resolved, or issues remain as a result of the Examiner conferring with the §101 panel that can be addressed, the undersigned respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview as previously agreed to as noted above in the current interview summary. The undersigned can be reached at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jerry A. Miller 30779/

Jerry A. Miller  
Registration No. 30,779

Dated: 6/26/2007

Please Send Correspondence to:  
Jerry A. Miller  
Miller Patent Services  
2500 Dockery Lane  
Raleigh, NC 27606  
Phone: (919) 816-9981  
Fax: (919) 816-9982  
Customer Number 24337

Application No.: 10/038,217

-31-